LEADERSHIP IN ACTION AT A COLLEGE TELEVISION STATION: AN INTERPRETIVE STUDY USING A FOUR-FRAME LEADERSHIP MODEL

By Stacey O. Irwin, A.B.D.
Instructor of Electronic Media and Film
Towson University, Towson, MD

BEA Student Advisor Division
2001 Convention-Las Vegas, NV
Running Head: LEADERSHIP

Contact: Stacey Irwin
Towson University
Department of Electronic Media and Film
8000 York Road
Towson, MD 21252
sirwin@towson.edu
(410) 830-2408

Leadership in Action at a Student Run Television Station: An Interpretive Study Using A Four-Frame Leadership Model

Abstract

Leadership within a student media organization is largely based upon the knowledge the student leader has learned before he or she enters a leadership role within the organization. Student media advisors can do something in a short period of time, to expand students understanding of leadership and organizations through metaphor usage and a leadership theory called *framing*. This study examines a group of nine student presidents and the *cognitive frames* they illustrated as they led their student run television station.

Introduction

Turn to any online bookstore web site and look up "leadership" and you will find thousands of books that promise to make you a better leader, help you hire a better leader, or tell you what type of leader you are or could become. A recent search on *Amazon.com* turned up 8618 books on leadership with the following titles occurring in the top twenty list; *The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership:Follow Them and People Will Follow You, Lives of Moral Leadership, Leadership and Self-Deception:Getting Out of the Box, Eyewitness to Power:The Essence of Leadership, Nixon to Clinton, The GE Way Field book: Jack Welch's Battle Plan for Corporate Revolution, Leading Change, Encouraging the Heart :A Leader's Guide to Rewarding and Recognizing Others, Results-Based Leadership, and Developing the Leaders Around You*. Read several of these titles and you will soon discover that a good definition of leadership is as ambiguous as the search for a "good" leader is becoming. A turn from the trait focused theories of leadership for a further look toward cognitive complexity theories is certainly in order to discover a new way of framing the way leadership can be viewed.

Leadership can certainly be named as a crucial element within an organization, but truth be known,

> leaders make things happen but things also make leaders happen. Context influences both what leaders must do and what they can do. No single formula is possible or advisable for the great range of situations that potential leaders encounter" (Bolman, 1997, p. 296).

Student media advisors know that this is true. Every day life is in flux when students are at the helm of the organization. The circumstances and structure of student media organizations are difficult and students encounter a great range of situations when they step up to lead their

organization.

One of the biggest challenges student media advisors have is cultivating leaders within their organizations, especially when it seems at times, that the organization runs despite the leadership or lack there of. A student who leads in the production studio doesn't always lead in the station office, but that doesn't mean the skills aren't there. All that can be said is that when good leaders are in officer in a media organization, things do happen, leadership does occur, and the student media advisor does breathe a sigh of relief. So, how can this process be moved along to cultivate leaders within student media organizations?

It seems that, instead of throwing it all up to fate, there must be a way of identifying and cultivating leadership within the ranks of the student media organization. While it doesn't seem possible to read *Amazon.com's* top ten best leadership books in your spare time between repairing the transmitter, reviewing the show tapes in your office, proofreading, and returning all of the syndication phone calls while battling the student government association for more money, it may be possible to think for a moment about your organization differently and your student staff differently so you can begin to cultivate leadership from the very beginning of your students collegiate careers within your student media organization. Reconceptualizing the idea of leadership will clear the path in a way that will help you better cultivate the leader in each student member starting from the leadership skills they come to you with. This can be accomplished by shifting the focus from developing leadership qualities and skills to learning to interpret the fabric of the organization.

Organizations are ambiguous and an organization's reality is hard to understand and

articulate. A successful metaphor can help decipher a situation so a student can understand it. Leaders in any top organization need to multitask their leadership styles to fit the situation if they want to be successful. Student leaders come to college with a varied background in leadership. They get most of their leadership knowledge from assimilating and judging their past leadership experiences from leadership role models like coaches, parents and supervisors or through an experience like holding an office in a high school organization. Many college students need just a bit of guidance and self confidence to realize their potential as leaders. Many students don't perceive themselves as the charismatic student government "leader" so they don't think much about leadership until they are the best producer in the programming line up and someone suggests they run for an office of their media organization.

Leadership comes in many forms and part of the job for the student media advisor is to cultivate the skills that each student is already displaying so they can lead more quickly. Teaching them the way to read their organization is the key to a good start for interpretive analysis and problem solving. Then, when and if time allows, student media advisors can expand the leadership horizons for their membership.

Framing the Organization

One overarching principle in organization theory today is called *framing* (Bolman, 1997, p. 12). This interpretive schema, coming from root disciplines of psychology, political science and anthropology (p. 13), seems to be fitting for consideration as arsenal for very busy student media advisors looking for a starting point for teaching students how to read their organizations. Those of us in the media understand how to read text and visual images and our students are

learning this too. The use of metaphors, then, is an aid that becomes particularly helpful when trying to provide students with a way that they can frame a situation in their organization to get a cognitive grasp of the issues at hand. Using a specific frame structure or viewing lens that will bring out an idea that they can act upon in a leading way, helps give the power to the student in an active way that doesn't depend upon many of the leadership traits that many people focus on when they pronounce someone a "good' leader. The idea of framing a situation comes from

> the hermeneutic approach to social analysis that views social life as a 'text' that has to be interpreted and 'read.' Taking the domain of organization theory as a reference point, it shows how we can open the way to different modes of understanding by using different metaphors to bring organizations into focus in different ways. Each metaphor opens a horizon of understanding and enacts a particular view of organizational reality (Morgan, 1997, p. 427).

Helping your students read or interpret the text of their organization's reality can help them become better leaders as they practice becoming better media professionals. When they can view their organization as a factory or an jungle, specific elements come to light that help sort out complexities and clear the way for decision making. Because media students have skills in interpretation, reading text for meaning, and imaginative minds, they can flex the same muscles in their organizations as in their classes and cultivate leadership that will help them throughout their lives.

Clearly, there isn't just one best way to be a leader. "Recent years have spawned a series of studies of 'good leadership' in organizations (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Clifford and Cavanaugh, 1985; Collins and Porras, 1994; Conger, 1989) and the concept of vision seems to comes closest to one guiding principle that all leaders have"(Bolman, 1997, p. 297). Additionally, some suggest that the capacity to communicate the vision effectively is even more important. The

human resource pool from student media organizations comes from students studying communication in some way. These students are already working on skills that make them terrific raw material for becoming leaders in media organizations. Student media advisors need just one specific place to begin cultivating the leadership abilities to bring their organizations and students along. I suggest that the framing concept is a great way to go very far, fast, in the short period of time you have to cultivate leadership with your students.

Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal, in their book Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership. (1997) describe a four frame analysis that tries to explain organizations based on metaphors as a way that helps the issues surface for the leader to identify and analyze (p. 229). Much of the following analysis will involve use of four different structures outlined in Reframing Organizations. An easy way to get started is to talk with your students about interpersonal and group dynamics. Ask them; What is really happening in this organization? Why do other people behave as they do? What can I, as a member, do about it (p. 142)? Organizations are ambiguous because there are many divided interests and goals set at many different levels. It is tough to sort out what is really going on inside some organizations to figure out how to lead. It is tough to even define the word organization. One view suggests that "organizations are 'structures of mutual expectation,' attached to roles which define what each of its members shall expect from others and from himself" (from Vickers 1967, pp. 109-10 in Weick, 1979, p. 3). A different view suggests that "an organization is 'an identifiable social entity pursuing multiple objectives through the coordinated activities and relations among members and objects. Such a social system is open-ended and dependent for survival on other individuals and

sub-systems in the larger entity-society" (Hunt, 1972, p. 4 in Weick, 1979, p. 3). These two competing examples of a definition of an organization show the complexity of defining organizations but even before students become official leaders. Research has shown that excellent followers do become excellent leaders. By thoughtfully bringing some of Bolman and Deal's four frame model to the forefront and teaching students to read their organization, students learn how to analyze situations in a way that helps them cultivate a leading edge.

Organization as Machine

Many times a student organization, like many companies in industry, will look at their television station, for example, as a structural organization. Students begin each semester by the orderly process of setting goals by formal roles and relationships. Either elections are held in the fall or the previous spring and students fill their positions and start the year of by creating agendas and getting the initial wheels of the semester turning. For most student groups this involves planning events and recruiting new members. Most officers feel that they've done their job if they've put the structure in place by organizing the environment and the division of labor. We might call this the machine metaphor, based on a structural frame.

> The assumptions of the structural frame reflect a belief that the right formal arrangements minimize problems and increase quality and performance. . . the structural perspective focuses on designing a pattern of roles and relationships that will accomplish collective goals as well as accommodate individual differences (Bolman, 1997, pp. 39-40).

One of the key issues in any leadership position is power. How does power effect the structure of the student organization? One way is through legitimate authority. The president of the student organization, as present, holds authority as a mechanism for implementing goals. There are general assumptions that there is one best solution and the organization, in weekly

meetings, is to search for the one best answer to that week's problems. The members usually feel that the answer will come from a complete, rational search for an answer. When conflict occurs or there is a breakdown in the machine, the leaders feel like there is a breakdown in the structure of the organization which negatively impacts the organization. What is the hierarchy of your student organization? Do the students, a faculty member, the chairperson of the connected academic program, or student government hold the legitimate power?

In many student media organization defining legitimate authority is not that easy. Sifting out and uncovering the structure of an organization can enlighten students about how their organizational structure works. How does this work from the perspective of a machine? How does the conveyer belt weave through the organization to reach the end result? Hanging up a flow chart of command in the organization's office would be helpful to clearly identify the organization's structure. The structure too, might also be reengineered to a collegial or professional bureaucracy or a looser adhocracy from the rigid machine bureaucracy if the organization would work better that way (pp. 66-68).

When media advisors explain and cultivate an organization that is clearly aware of its structure and that the structure is followed, legitimate authority holds control over all student for results and rational solutions are found and resolved for all problems and situations. The student leader who adheres to this structure and finds this as his or her most comfortable leadership style will be a very successful leader as long as the issues and problems are structural in nature. But, even if you have a dynamo in office as president of you organization you advise, things don't always flow like the machine metaphor for this frame suggests. Where can a student media

advisor go from here? Possibly to take a look at the people that run the organization.

Organization as Family

Why do students do extracurricular activities? What prompts them to make room between their hours of work, school and home life to volunteer for a shift at the radio station or to produce a show for the TV station? Sometimes the organization falters when there is a mismatch between the organizational goals and the students running the organization. One of the main things student media advisors can do, according to Bolman and Deal (1997)is to focus on showing your students how to foster empowerment in a family environment.

> This perspective regards people's skills, attitudes, energy, and commitment as vital resources capable of either making or breaking an enterprise. We all know that organizations can be alienating, dehumanizing, and frustrating. Such conditions waste talent, distort lives, and sometimes convince individuals to fight back, devoting most of their time and effort to beating the system. The human resource frame champions another possibility--that organizations can also be energizing, productive, and mutually rewarding (pp. 101-102).

When there are human resource issues within the organization using legitimate authority is problematic because the "one right way approach (p. 39)" doesn't allow for integration of individual and organizational needs. By showing your officers and producers how to focus on collaboration, participation and openness, they can move the organization to a place where student who are members feel empowered. This frame does assume that incompatibility among goals between members can be reduced and this sometimes depends on the personalities of your members.

The focus for the human resource frame is on the needs and perspectives of the family and the members in it. How can students dialogue to explore differences and find common solutions?

What is the interplay between the organization and the members? Bolman and Deal cite Abraham Maslow's 1954 research that indicates that human needs are based on a hierarchy of emotional issues. Most important for group members are the physiological needs like food, water and oxygen, feelings of safety from danger, love and belongingness, the ideals of self esteem like being valued and valuing others, and self actualization or the ability to reach full human potential (p. 104). Student officers, editors, producers, and managers can cultivate an empowering environment that takes into account belongingness, being valued, and reaching full potential through the ways they organize and administer the human needs within their organization.

Another body of research Bolman and Deal draw upon is Douglas McGregor's 1960 research on the Theory X & Theory Y (p.105). The overarching principle behind this theory suggests that the perspective from which managers view other people determines how they manage and lead members of the organization. If a student president perceives the staff as lazy and resistant he/she will act in a way of self fulfilling prophecy and lead from that position. This is Theory X. Follower actions from this attitude of tight controls and coercion results in subtle sabotage and antagonism. Theory Y involves Maslow's hierarchy of needs (p. 104) of self-interest in that they receive organizational rewards from doing good work (p. 106). When a student leader arrange the organization towards organizational rewards, the organization as a whole is happier.

Sometimes when resources are scarce and there are breakdowns in communications, the only thing a leader can move to is on emphasize common goals and mutual influence by communicating openly and combine advocacy for the organization as seen through the family

metaphor. Many times participative management, were all students participate in decision making, helps move the stagnant organization forward to improve morale and productivity. A student leader who traditionally focuses on the machine metaphor for leading has a new way of looking at the organization with the additional frame of organization as family. Through promotion within the organization, training and education, and survey feedback, an organization can move toward the idea of the human element and the family is at the center of the organization.

Organization as Jungle

An organization with multiple, inconsistent goals and underlying political forces emphasizing conflict and power would be an organization in the grips of the jungle (p. 346). If your student leader isn't Tarzan, then thinking about the organization as a jungle might sift out some of the power issues and scarce resource issues that prevent leadership to move forward. When coalitions of individuals and interest group cliques are at odds showing strong enduring differences among individuals and groups on values, perceptions, and beliefs, the organization is politically entangled (p. 182). Decisions about allocation of scarce resources might be at the heart of the conflict and this means that conflict is key in the dynamics of the media organization and power is the most important thing.

> The assumptions of the political frame define sources of political dynamics in organizations. A coalition forms because of interdependence among its members; they need one another, even though their interests may be only partially in synchrony. The assumption of enduring difference implies that political activity will be more visible and dominant under conditions of diversity than under conditions of homogeneity (p. 164).

This doesn't mean that a student leader or student organization who is focused can't work in this jungle environment, but they need to be aware that the organization is jungle like.

By recognizing that the organization seems to be power concentrated tightly regulated or diffuse and at odds, can be half the battle. When organizational goals are largely the result of bargaining, negotiations, and an exercise of power how can goals be set? Moving to goal setting by authorities is a structural idea but many times this cannot work because of the political power plays by organizational factions and an organization will spin its wheels. Many times goals set by negotiations among members with different resources is the only way to move forward. While authority is only one legitimate form of power in the structural frame of the machine metaphor, there are many others.

The jungle metaphor shows that the organization has divergent interests and conflict over scarce resources is inevitable. How does each group articulate preferences and mobilize power? When the organization can view conflict is not as a problem or signal something is amiss but as a natural process within the organization, and that conflict is inevitable due to limited resources, and that environmental diversity increases possibility of conflict, the organization can move forward. "A student leader needs to be able to sort out the players ; who are the authorities or targets of influence and partisans or initiators of influence" (p. 168).

The key to leading in this organizational environment is in deciphering the sources of power. Sometimes the power source can be the legitimate power of the organization's president or editor as authority figure. Other times the student with the most information and expertise of the organization can control the power through rewards. Sometimes the student who holds the power is just the one who has personal power called charisma. Sometimes student groups can become entangled in coercive power where blocks of students interfere and punish others. The

first step to diffusing any of these power plays for the good of the organization is to recognize where the power lies in the organization. Once this is done, both the students and the media advisor can facilitate alliances and networks and increase access to and control of the organizational agendas (p. 170).

A political environment, like the jungle, can be energizing, constructive and creative but also debilitating, hostile, and devastating. Students must understand the conditions their organization is living in, that everyone can't have what they want, that people can't ignore each other, and that the organization's members interpret scarcity and power differently. Some stability can be implemented through agenda setting which states interests and direction for the organization (p. 179), networking and coalition building (p. 182), negotiations (p. 186). and Machiavellian like webs within relationships. One of the most well known political strategies has been coined the Win-Win approach, which means taking a position and then make concessions to reach agreements so all groups leave with something they wanted (p. 187). This is certainly possible where student groups are concerned. Use of space, time, equipment, and access can all be politically motivated issues within your student organization. Using the jungle metaphor for your students, can help reveal the text in a way that allows them to interpret the situation for change making.

Organization as Temple

The structural frame interprets and illuminates basic issues of meaning and faith that make symbols a powerful aspect of human experience (p. 216). The underlying assumption of the symbolic frame is that what is most important about an event is not what happens but what it

means within the organization. The same event can mean different things to different people within the organization because interpretation is different. Students who recognize this can frame the organization and provide interpretation which brings the group together is a satisfying way. One way symbolism works is through being 'loosely-coupled.' This term suggests that disturbances within the organization may have limited far reaching effect because the organizational elements are loosely bound together with weak common variables. This is how, in the face of leadership crisis, the organization can still move along and complete many of its functions (Weick, 1979, p. 111).

> The symbolic frame sees life as more fluid that linear. Organizations function like complex, constantly changing, organic pinball machines. Decisions, actors, plans, and issues continuously carom through an elastic, ever changing labrynth of cushions, barriers, and traps. . . Symbols embody and express an organization's culture-the interwoven patterns of beliefs, values, practices, and artifacts that define for members who they are and how they do things. Culture is both a product and a process. As a product, it embodies accumulated wisdom from those who came before us. As a process, it is continually renewed and re-created as newcomers learn the old ways and eventually become teachers themselves. (Bolman, 1997, p. 217).

The temple metaphor suggests that the organizational events and processes are ambiguous and uncertain and it is impossible to know why it happened, what happened, what will happen next. So, how can a student interpret this organization to provide leadership? The key is to create symbols in the face of ambiguity and uncertainty to resolve confusion, increase predictability, provide direction. Many events and processes are more important for what they express then for what they produce so myths, rituals, and organizational ceremonies bring out meaning and order. In many ways students can interpret organizational symbols and history to feel more a part of the organization. Making the history readily available to the students within

the organization can be a helpful start in bringing out the temple metaphor. What organizational symbols does your organization have? Is there a logo, design, or mast head that heralds your organization along in an identifiable way? What myths prevail throughout your organization? Do students feel like there is a myth that successful members of the organization network with past members and get industry jobs easier? Are there stories and fairy tales about the unpreprepared producer on the first day of the shoot? Do the students in your organization have a ritual end of the year farewell to seniors ceremony? An organization makes a culture all its own. Knowing how to read the culture of your organization could be the key to success for student leadership within your organization.

Organizational Background

WMJF-TV, a low power television station and campus cable outlet at Towson University, Towson Maryland. The organization has had eight different student presidents in its nine years of life. The station is student run station with student officers and show producers. The funding is generated from student government fees, some advertising dollars and fundraising events, and very recently, support from the academic department of Electronic Media and Film. The general manager and organizational advisor are full time faculty members. WMJF TV went on the air in the fall of 1991, acted as the WB affiliate for Baltimore for two years, changed their format to an underlying syndicator to keep the station broadcasting for twenty four hours a day after WB moved to another station, and has recently converted to digital, changing their channel from 61 to 16, and is in the process of becoming A class status with the FCC.

The same faculty member has been the creator and general manager of WMJF TV since it

was founded. He spent some time recently, to analyze the leadership skills of WMJF-TV's past elected presidents. The four frame model is used to show the different types of frames that student leader cultivate and use through their tenure in the organization. Some past presidents seemed to use two frames but most were oriented toward one perceptual frame and rarely used more than two frames in their decision making within the organizational structure. The leadership insights of each president come from the point of view of WMJF's general manager, who worked closely with each student.

A Frame Analysis

Kim was WMJF's first president. Kim was a spark plug whose strength was motivating and organizing people. She was competently technically, but television production was not her area of expertise. She led the way in approaching the SGA to provide initial funding and organized numerous meetings to organize and create a new organization, then known as TSTV, to run the TV station. She had a strong personality and as a leader pushed, pulled and chided people to achieve the station's goals. She worked closely with the general manager and the two were in agreement on most everything. She frequently asked his opinion and frequently deferred to his recommendations. The station manager viewed her participation as a motivating role in promoting the advancement of the station.

Kim's motivating attitude is indicative of a leader who is instilled in the human resource frame. She looked to people to start the organization. Kim also knew how to politically maneuver herself to gain access to the Student Government Association to attain the initial $ 40,000 needed to start the new station. She worked closely with the general manager, another

political move, to attain her goals. In the end, she did achieve her goals and provided the kind of leadership needed to get this "start-up" off the ground.

Chris the stations second president, provided leadership throughout the stations sign-on period. Chris's strength was in production. He led the way and set the example for a good producer. He was an active hands on manager who frequently did much of the production himself. This was somewhat frustrating since he felt that station producers should have been taking more of the lead. He held occasional meetings, but relied more on individual consultations as a way of achieving goals. Time management was sometimes a problem for Chris since he had to do much of the production work for the station. He was not a dynamic leader, but well respected by the station staff.

Chris was a political leader in that he gained his power from his expert authority of knowing the production equipment at the station. This power became a double edged sword because he wanted everyone to join him in this expert status but he didn't know how to do it. He was not concerned with structure of the organization and he had infrequent staff meetings. He did not understand that different people within an organization have different goals so the human resource frame was lost on him. The scare resource was the resource of Chris's time, which was largely spent doing instead of delegating.

Donna, next on the presidential list, was only president for a short period of time. She had previous production experience and spent a portion of her time commuting back and forth between work and home on weekends, where she worked for a professional station. She did not appear to be heavily involved in productions at the station, but was accessible to provide

guidance. Donna delegated responsibilities for shows and did not get heavily involved in production and was not around the station a great deal of time each week.

Donna showed her leadership style through a structural frame. She attended to the delegation of tasks in her absence and relied on her expert power through her knowledge base of television production to carry her. She did not provide human resource motivation and was not around when the structure she implemented broke down.

Rick provided WMJF with political commentary and this moved him into a leadership role as president of the station. He had a very strong take charge personality. He was not particularly strong in production. He held some meetings but preferred to manage the station from a top down basis. His strong personality and views resulted in disagreement with the SGA members to the disadvantage of the station. He didn't listen a whole lot to others point of views as they related to a variety of issues which hurt his credibility both internally and externally to the station.

Rick also seemed to move in the lens of the political frame. He embodied the structural ideas of a top down bureaucracy but didn't provide meetings to fuel the machine so it fell dead in its tracks. He saw himself as an authoritative leader, but without a nod to the goals of the human resource frame and the other members of his organization, its members generated coalitions and the organization became divided.

Mark followed Rick as president at WMJF. His strength was computers and production, and the station benefitted from the expertise in this area. He, as some other presidents in the past, was heavily involved in production, and probably shouldered too much direct responsibility for production rather than holding others responsible. Mark was politically savvy and used it to a

good advantage in re-establishing relations with the SGA.

Mark translated his efforts in producing a good show to leading an organization. He relied on the political lens, expert power concerning his television production and computer skills and legitimate power as president to interface and join in the SGA coalition to accomplish organizational goals. He did not show strength in the area of human relations and relied on his own efforts to complete many production related tasks. He did not seem concerned with structural issues that did not relate to the use of the television equipment.

Paul also came to be president from running a successful television show. He was universally admired by the staff. His easy going manner and interpersonal skills lead to strong relationships with staff members. Productions seemed to go relatively smooth and Paul was able to effectively delegate responsibility to staff members. He seemed to handle the responsibilities of office well and was not overwhelmed by the position.

Paul was a human resources and a structural manager. He made sure people were happy and their goals were met in producing the shows they wanted to with the equipment they wanted to and attended to the structural mechanism of delation to get things done by the staff. He also was politically savvy in that he was a charismatic leader and held that charismatic power as a leader.

Melissa had a goal when it came to television and it was news. She came up the ranks as talent, a reporter, show producer, and then on to the WMJF presidency. She was likable and had good rapport with students. She spent a reasonable amount of time at the station, although toward the end of her tenure as president she spent less time due to commitments at a local TV

station. She was skilled in politics and interacted well with the SGA.

Melissa's political savvy came from her interest in news; campus news, local news, national news. She did interface well in garnering funds from the SGA and showed expert power through her interest in the television production process. She attended to the human relations side of the organization through her good rapport and enthusiasm in knowing many members of the organization.

Mark was the only president to serve the station for two and a half years. Elections were held early when Melissa took the job at the local station and Mark was elected to the presidency. Mark was probably the most outstanding resident the station has had. His success was due to a very high level of motivation and a very high level of dedication to the station. He slept, ate and drank the station. Through sheer work alone, he greatly advanced the cause of the station, which was awarded the Student Activity's Leadership Award for Best Organization for two consecutive years. He was concerned about creating a positive work environment and went to great efforts to create a positive nurturing atmosphere at the station. He worked very well with both peers and superiors. His week point was that, in pursuing his goals, he went around the chain of command much to the chagrin of some administrators. He was very helpful to producers and was often hands on in his help.

Mark displayed more of a multi-frame perspective than the other presidents. He attended to the human resources element by helping out and pitching in and leading in the tasks at hand. He exemplified mutual goal setting and attaining. He was structurally focused, providing communications to everyone, holding meetings on a timely basis, and spearheading breakdowns

quickly. He also attended to the symbolic gestures through staff parties, group events, and organizational rituals that other presidents had not thought to develop or maintain. His weakness was not that he wasn't politically minded because he made strides with the SGA under some difficult restraints, but that he didn't understand or chose to ignore the political arena of the university at large in the attainment of the station goals.

Conclusion

Each president exemplified one strong frame, which is indicative of leadership. Several of the presidents slid back and forth between two frames in a more sophisticated leadership style. Only one presidential leader of the nine, Mark, showed use of three frames and the general manager stated that he was probably the most outstanding president the station had. The use of multiple frames and reframing the organization to view the system in different ways is a practice and quite possibly also an art. "The essence of reframing is examining the same situation from multiple vantage points to develop a holistic picture. Effective leaders change lenses when things don't make sense or aren't working (p. 280).

When the student media advisor looks into the organization they advise, they quickly attend to the most current crisis at hand. The taking care of the general day to day business takes up much of media advisors time and talents. Taking a short vacation from the current dilemma of the day to view and discuss the leadership ideas of metaphor and the four frame model with stretch far within the fabric of the organization. The abilities for the students and their advisor to view the machine, the family, the jungle and the temple within the organization will shed light on some of the ambiguity that is the organization of today. "Leaders fail when they take to narrow a

view of the context in which they are working. Unless they can think flexibly about organizations and see them from multiple angles, they will be unable to deal with the full range of issues that they will inevitably encounter" (p. 380).

References

Bennis, W.G. and Nanus, B. (1985) *Leaders: strategies for taking charge*. New York: HarperCollins.

Bolman, L. & T. Deal (1997). *Reframing organizations; Artistry, choice, and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Clifford, D.K. & Cavanaugh R.E. (1985). *The winning performance*. New York: Bantam Books.

Collins J.C. & Porras J.I. (1994) *Built to last: Successful habits of visionary companies*. New York: HarperBusiness.

Conger J.A. (1989) *The charismatic leader: Behind the mystique of successful leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mackerron, John. General Manager, WMJF-TV (Channel 61). Written observations. November 2000.

Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper Collins.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organizations.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Weick, K. (1979) *The social psychology of organizing.* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.